



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,440	09/05/2003	Veshaal Singh	50277-2209	8474
29989	7590	09/02/2009	EXAMINER	
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP			PATEL, MANGLESH M	
2055 GATEWAY PLACE				
SUITE 550			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN JOSE, CA 95110			2178	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/02/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/656,440	SINGH, VESHAAL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MANGLESH M. PATEL	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 June 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,4-12,17,20-28 and 33-40 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,4-12,17,20-28 and 33-40 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Second Non-Final action is responsive to the amendment filed on 6/12/2009.
2. This Second Non-Final is in response to the new 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph rejection addressing the previous claim language, including the new grounds of rejection and cited art.
3. In the amendment claims 1, 4-12, 17, 20-28 and 33-40 remain pending. Claim 1 is the independent claim.

Withdrawn Rejections

4. The 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of claims 1, 4-12, 17, 20-28 and 33-40 with cited references of Vedula (U.S. 6,823,495) in view of Chan (U.S. 6,643,633) have been withdrawn in light of the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. **Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph**, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claim 1 discloses moving said XML document directly into said relational database without creating and storing any representation of said XML document. However the mapping scheme disclosed in fig 3 numeral 340 is not only associated with the original XML document thus comprising representations but is also stored, it must be stored since it was created within the computer. The claim describes what the invention doesn't do (negative limitations) instead of what it does perform. The invention maps the XML document into a database, this is possible because of the mapping scheme, which itself is a stored representation within the computer system and read by the computer system to store the mapped data into the respective locations within a relational database.

7. **Regarding Dependent claims 4-12, 17, 20-28 and 33-40**, are rejected because they inherit the deficiencies of claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 4-12, 17, 20-28 and 33-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vedula (U.S. 6,823,495, filed Sep 14, 2000) in view of Shadmon (U.S. 6,804,677, filed Feb. 26, 2001).

Regarding Independent claims 1, A computer-implemented method for generating and using a mapping scheme, the method comprising: Receiving commands from a user, wherein said commands establish a mapping between one or more attributes of an XML document and one or more attributes of a relational database; Based on said commands, automatically generating a mapping scheme that represents said mapping, wherein said mapping scheme includes at least one of: multiple attributes of said XML document mapped to a single attribute of said relational database; and multiple attributes of said relational database mapped to a single attribute of said XML document; and using said mapping scheme to perform a single transformation that moves said XML document directly into said relational database: (a) without materializing the entire XML document separate from said XML document and said relational database during said transformation, and (b) without creating and storing any representation of said XML document separate from said XML document and said relational database during said transformation; wherein the one or more attributes of said relational database correspond to one or more columns in one or more tables in said relational database; wherein the method is performed by one or more computing devices.

Vedula teaches mapping between attributes of a source and target based on user commands (see abstract). He discloses that multiple attributes of a source or target are mapped between each other (see fig 1 & 7a & 12a & column 12, lines 25-35). Vedula shows that records which are part of a hierarchical tree are mapped between source and target documents (column 9, lines 10-25 & fig 1). Each record represents a mapping between a set such as record Field 1 from source to record field 1 to target, which is a child node of the parent node BLANK specification (see fig 1 and column 10, lines 1-16). Vedula discloses "The source and target objects may be Schemas, spreadsheets documents, databases, or other information sources..." (see abstract). Although Vedula teaches that the target objects is a database he fails to explicitly disclose a relational database. Shadmon disclosing mapping and indexing XML data into a

relational database (see column 7, lines 30-67 & column 8, lines 1-55). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Vedula's mapping system to support relational databases. The motivation for doing so would have been for improving the mapping of data into relational databases for efficient searching and browsing.

Regarding Dependent claims 4 and 20, Vedula discloses *wherein said mapping scheme further includes instructions on how to collapse a number of attributes of said source into a smaller number of attributes of said target* (see figure 4b numeral 46 & column 10, lines 54-67, thus providing collapsing of attributes).

Regarding Dependent claim 5 and 21, Vedula discloses *wherein said mapping scheme further includes instructions on how to expand a number of attributes of said source to a greater number of attributes of said target* (see figure 5 numeral 46, thus providing expanding of attributes).

Regarding Dependent claims 6 and 22, Vedula discloses wherein:

- *The step of receiving commands from a user includes receiving user input that specifies a condition, and an action associated with the condition* (column 9, lines 25-35, wherein schema is the specified condition or rule used prior to the transformation process); and
- *The method further comprises the steps of performing an operation that includes converting data, based on said mapping scheme, from the source to a format associated with the target* (column 9, lines 40-55, wherein converting data is the transformation done based on the mapping);
- *During performance of said operation, performing the steps of determining whether the condition is satisfied* (column 9, lines 25-35, wherein the condition is specified in the schema and evaluated by the XSL engine shown in fig 2 prior to the transformation); and
- *If the condition is satisfied, then performing said action* (column 9, lines 25-35, wherein the condition is specified in the schema and evaluated by the XSL engine shown in fig 2 prior to the transformation, wherein the transformation is the action performed based on the schema being satisfied).

Regarding Dependent claims 7 and 23, Vedula discloses wherein:

- *The step of receiving commands from a user includes receiving user input that specifies a specific set of instructions (column 9, lines 25-35); and*
- *The method further comprises the steps of performing an operation that includes converting data, based on said mapping scheme, from the source to a format associated with the target (column 9, lines 40-55); and*
- *During performance of said operation, executing the specific set of instructions to affect said operation (column 9, lines 40-55).*

Regarding Dependent claims 8 and 24, Vedula discloses wherein:

- *The step of receiving commands from a user includes receiving user input that declares a variable to which values can be assigned (column 9, lines 25-35 & column 12, lines 50-69);*
- *The method further comprises the steps of performing an operation that includes converting data, based on said mapping scheme, from the source to a format associated with the target (column 9, lines 25-35 & column 12, lines 50-69); and*
- *During performance of said operation, using said variable (column 9, lines 25-35 & column 12, lines 50-69).*

Regarding Dependent claims 9 and 25, Vedula discloses wherein:

- *The step of receiving commands from a user includes receiving user input that specifies a precompiled routine (column 12, lines 50-69 & column 13, lines 1-25); and*
- *The method further comprises the steps of performing an operation that includes converting data, based on said mapping scheme, from the source to a format associated with the target (column 12, lines 50-69 & column 13, lines 1-25); and*
- *During performance of said operation, calling said precompiled routine to affect said operation (column 12, lines 50-69 & column 13, lines 1-25).*

Regarding Dependent claims 10 and 26, Vedula discloses:

- *Reading source data definition that includes information about said plurality of attributes of said source (see abstract & fig 1 & 7a & 12a & column 12, lines 25-35);*

- *Reading target data definition that includes information about said plurality of attributes of said target (see abstract & fig 1 & 7a & 12a & column 12, lines 25-35);*
- *Based on said source data definition and said target data definition, presenting to said user an interface that identifies said plurality of attributes of said source and said plurality of attributes of said target (see abstract & fig 1 & 7a & 12a & column 12, lines 25-35);*
- *Wherein said step of receiving commands from said user interface is performed by receiving said commands through said interface (see abstract & fig 1 & 7a & 12a & column 12, lines 25-35).*

Regarding Dependent claims 11 and 27, Vedula discloses *wherein said mapping scheme includes instructions on how to collapse a number of hierarchical levels of said source into a smaller number of hierarchical levels of said target* (see figure 4b numeral 46 & column 10, lines 54-67).

Regarding Dependent claims 12 and 28, Vedula discloses *wherein said mapping scheme includes instructions on how to expand a number of hierarchical levels of said source to a greater number of hierarchical levels of said target* (see figure 5 numeral 46).

Regarding Dependent claim 17, the claim describes a computer readable medium performing the method of claim 1 and is therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding Dependent claims 33 and 36, Vedula discloses a plurality of said source are related to each other according to a first hierarchy that includes multiple hierarchical levels; a plurality of attributes of said target are related to each other according to a second hierarchy that includes multiple hierarchical levels; and said commands establish, in said mapping, that a particular hierarchical level of said source is mapped to a particular hierarchical level of said target, wherein said particular hierarchical level of said source is at a different depth, within said first hierarchy, than the depth of said particular hierarchical level of said target within said second hierarchy (Vedula teaches in figs 1 & 3c, column 9, lines 1-55, wherein source objects shown as attributes on figure 3c include a hierarchy that includes multiple levels, for example 18a and 18b of fig 1. Wherein the target also includes a multiple hierarchy of levels. Wherein the mappings include different depths).

Regarding Dependent claim 34 and 37, Vedula disclose wherein said single transformation is performed by executing commands defined in a programming language that supports operations to fetch said set of data directly from said source and store said set of data directly into said target (see abstract, see fig 1 & 7a & 12a & column 12, lines 25-35, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

Regarding Dependent claim 35 and 38, Vedula disclose wherein: said mapping scheme includes instructions which define that operations included in said single transformation are grouped to represent a transaction; and using said mapping scheme to perform said single transformation further comprises performing said operations in said transaction (see abstract, see fig 1 & 7a & 12a & column 12, lines 25-35, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

Regarding Dependent claims 39 and 40, Vedula discloses wherein using said mapping scheme to perform said single transformation comprises: processing a first XML element of said XML document to move said first XML element from said XML document to said relational database; and after processing of said first XML element is completed, processing a second XML element of said XML document to move said second XML element from said XML document to said relational database, wherein said second XML element is different from said first XML element (see abstract, see fig 1 & 7a & 12a & column 12, lines 25-35, including the explanation provided in the Independent claim).

It is noted that any citation [[s]] to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. [[See, MPEP 2123]]

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 6/12/2009 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mangleesh M. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W 6 am-3 pm T, TH 6 am-2pm, Fr 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mangleesh M. Patel
Patent Examiner
August 28, 2009

/Mangleesh M Patel/
Mangleesh Patel
Examiner, Art Unit 2178

/CESAR B PAULA/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178